

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing

(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/009496

International filing date (day/month/year)
18.05.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
25.05.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06K19/07, G06K7/00

Applicant
MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☒ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Koegler, L

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2785



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/009496

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/009496

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-12
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-12
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-12
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VI Certain documents cited

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.10)

and / or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.9)

see form 210

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

PCT/JP2005/009496

Re Item V**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP-A-1 321 889 (MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD) 25 June 2003 (2003-06-25)

D2: JUELS, RIVEST, SZYDLO: "The Blocker Tag: Selective Blocking of RFID tags for Consumer Privacy" CONFERENCE ON COMPUTER AND COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY 2003, ACM PRESS, October 2003 (2003-10), pages 103-111, XP002341165 Washington DC ISBN: 1-58113-738-9

2. Document D1 (see paragraphs 3 to 18) discloses the same type of communication protocol and collision handling between a reader and RFID tags as described in the present application. However, this document does not address the problem of blocking readout of tags for the purpose of preventing unwanted reading of RFID tags.

The latter problem is addressed by document D2 in context with a binary tree singulation method. According to sections 2 to 4 of this document, the problem can be solved by a blocker tag that interferes with the tree-walking singulation protocol of the reader in that the blocker tag causes a collision, either for the whole tree or for a subtree. In other words, the blocker tag simultaneously sends a "0" value and a "1" value for bit positions of the tag identifier corresponding to blocked tree nodes to be blocked. Consequently, the collisions are generated for all tags having an ID value lying in the blocked part of the binary tree so that these tags cannot be read. In section 2 of document D1 it is mentioned that this method can be adapted to the well known ALOHA singulation protocol, i.e. to time slotted protocols where a collision occurs when two or more tags respond in the same time slot. It is therefore not inventive to apply the blocker tag principle known from D2, i.e. causing collisions in the singulation procedure, to the system of D1 that uses a time slotted anticollision protocol. This necessarily implies that the blocker tag has to respond in the same time slot in which at least one other tag responds. The skilled man thereby arrives

at the subject-matter of claims 1-7 and 9 to 12 without having to exercise an inventive step.

The prior art does not suggest a timer circuit for validating the function of the response slot determination unit only for a predetermined time (claim 8).

Re Item VI

Certain documents cited

Certain published documents

Application No Patent No	Publication date (day/month/year)	Filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (valid claim) (day/month/year)
WO2004/102313 A	25.11.2004	30.4.2004	29.9.2003

Re Item VII

Certain defects in the international application

The independent claims are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features which are known in combination from the prior art (documents D1 or D2) being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(I) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).

The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT).

Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in documents D1 and D2 is not mentioned in the description, nor are these documents identified therein.